REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending and stand rejected. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested in view of the above amendment and the following remarks.

Claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 USC 101 on the grounds that the invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner stated, in part, "the recited method steps do not apply, involved, use or advance the technological arts since all the steps can be performed in the mind of the user or by use of pencil and paper and no specific technology (e.g. computer, processor) is expressly recited in the body of the claims".

Claims 1-19 have been amended to describe the use in the method of a "stored program executable by a processor". Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 101 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 USC 102(a) as anticipated by Hall for the reasons given in paragraphs 4-18 of the office action.

As per claims 1 and 20, the office action indicated that the elements of claims 1 and 20 are described in Hall's Introduction, paragraph 4, and sections 2.2, 3.1, 3.2, 4, 4.1, 4.2, and 6.

Applicant respectfully disagrees that all recited elements of claims 1 or 20 are disclosed in the above cited sections or anywhere else in Hall.

Claim 1 recites: a method utilizing a stored program executable by a processor for mediating access to a person's availability information via a communication medium, comprising the steps of: creating one or more filters, each filter including information defining how the **availability information** is to be presented, a parameter used to identify an individual to whom the access is to be granted, and associating a filter with the individual; identifying the individual when the individual attempts to access the filtered information; retrieving the filter associated with the individual; and **presenting to the individual up-to-date availability information** processed by the associated filter.

Claim 20 recites: a program storage device having stored programs executable by a computer for performing method steps for mediating access to a person, the method comprising the steps of: creating one or more filters, each filter for processing the **availability information and to produce filtered information**, each filtered information presenting a different version of the availability information; setting parameters for identifying individuals intended to receive filtered information; identifying individuals attempting to access filtered information, and selecting a filter based on the identified individual; and **presenting to the identified individual filtered information** corresponding to the selected filter.

The 'availability information' as claimed refers information on the availability of the person to whom access is sought. Examples of availability information include a calendar, a schedule, or range of time during which the person is available to communicate with the individual seeking access to the person.

Hall proposes use of electronic mail channels for restricting access to a users email inbox for purposes of avoiding unwanted emails. An email account owner assigns a number of email channels, each email channel having a distinct structured address which contains the account name and a channel identifier. Each legitimate correspondent is allowed to know one of these access addresses. The account owner is provided simple controls for opening a new channel, closing a channel, and switching a channel by notifying selected correspondents of a new channel that is replacing the current one. A correspondent who does not have a channel

identifier will be denied access to the account owner's email inbox. In Hall's proposed method, the correspondent either gains access if he possesses a channel identifier or is denied access if he does not have a channel identifier. The account owner does not provide any information on his availability. Thus, Hall neither discloses nor suggests use of "availability information" or "up-to-date availability information", much less "presenting to the individual up-to-date availability information" as recited in claim 1. Nor does Hall disclose or suggest any "filter for processing the availability information and to produce filtered information... and presenting to the identified individual filtered information corresponding to the selected filter", as recited in claim 20.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 20 are patentably distinct and not rendered obvious in view of Hall. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 11 recites, inter alia, "applying the appropriate filter to up-to-date availability information of the person". As discussed above, Hall discloses nothing about 'availability information' of the account owner, much less applying the appropriate filter to up-to-date availability information. Thus, the method as claimed in claim 11 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of Hall.

Claims 14 and 17 have been amended to further define the invention.

Claims 2-10 depend from claim 1 and claims 12-19 depend upon claim 11. The dependent claims are patentable over Hall for the same reasons given above for the independent claims.

9

For the foregoing reasons, the present application including claims 1-20 is believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner's early and favorable action is respectfully urged.

Respectfully submitted,

Frank Chau
Reg. No. 34,136
Attorney for Applicant(s)

F. Chau & Associates, LLC
1900 Hempstead Tnpk., Suite 501
East Meadow, NY 11553
TEL.: (516) 357-0091
FAX: (516) 357-0092